DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 376 854 IR 055 333

AUTHOR Kemper, Ann L.
TITLE Faculty Status of Theological Librarians in the American Theological Library Association.
PUB DATE Aug 93
NOTE 49p.; Master's Research Paper, Kent State University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Undetermined (040) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Libraries; *Academic Rank (Professional); *College Faculty; Employment Level; Higher Education; Library Administration; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS American Theological Library Association; *Faculty Status; Head Librarians; *Theological Libraries

ABSTRACT

This paper is the result of a survey of the institutional members of the American Theological Library Association. The Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) defines faculty status as: (1) freedom to exercise independent judgment in performance of professional duties and a formal method of performance review, (2) adoption of an academic form of governance similar to other faculties on campus, (3) eligibility for membership in the faculty senate or other governing body, (4) salaries comparable to other academic faculty, (5) tenure policies equivalent to other faculty, (6) promotion decisions made by a peer review board and based on professional effectiveness, (7) leaves of absence (i.e. sabbatical) available, (8) access to funds for research and development, and (9) freedom to provide access to information regardless of content (protection from censorship). Of the 106 institutions responding (70% response rate), 7% offer full faculty status to all librarians. When the institutions defined faculty status themselves, without strict adherence to ACRL guidelines, the result was that 19% offer faculty status to all of their librarians, 11% offer it to some and 6% do not grant faculty status at all. All of the head librarians attained the faculty status significantly more than often regular staff librarians. 41% of respondents considered faculty status an issue, 49% did not, and 10% gave either a mixed response or none at all. The following qualifications and activities of librarians in theological libraries are also examined: degrees, course instruction, lectures or paper presentations, membership in professional committees, research, and professional publication. Appendices provide six tables summarizing data, survey cover letter, and questionnaire. (Contains 39 references.) (MAS)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

IR

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 376 854

# FACULTY STATUS OF THEOLOGICAL LIBRARIANS IN THE AMERICAN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

A Master's Research Paper submitted to the
Kent State University School of Library Science
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree Master of Library Science

by

Ann L. Kemper

August, 1993

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. DuMont

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Ross 333



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## FACULTY STATUS OF THEOLOGICAL LIBRARIANS IN THE AMERICAN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

Faculty status of academic librarians has been much debated since the 1950s. In 1975 the Association of College & Research Libraries developed recommendations for faculty status for academic librarians, which were revised in 1992. These standards serve more as a reference point in assessing the condition of faculty status than as an actual guideline for most institutions. Recent surveys have shown that approximately 67 percent of librarians working in academic libraries enjoy some form of faculty status. The only survey of theological librarians was conducted in 1978 and showed that 33 percent of head librarians in theological libraries enjoyed all of the characteristics of faculty status, while only 4 percent of other librarians enjoyed the same status. This paper is the result of a second survey of the institutional members of the American Theological Library Association. Overall, 90 percent of the institutions surveyed offer some form of faculty status to some or all of their librarians. Thirty-four percent of head librarians have all the characteristics of faculty status, while 8 percent of other librarians have the same characteristics.

Master's Research Paper by

Ann L. Kemper

B.A., Taylor University, 1977

M.Div., Duke Divinity School, 1988

M.L.S., Kent State University, 1993

Approved by

Adviser Guy Berry Date 12-1-93

ii

## TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Abstract | |
| List of Tables | iv |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Literature Review | 5 |
| Research Objectives | 11 |
| Methodology | 13 |
| Data Analysis | 16 |
| Significance | 26 |
| Bibliography | 28 |
| Appendix A | 32 |
| Appendix B | 39 |

## LIST OF TABLES


Table 1 ATLA institutions and nine standards of faculty status.

Table 2 Comparison of head librarians with other librarians.

Table 3 Faculty qualifications.

Table 4 Faculty status and faculty qualifications.

Table 5 Institutional setting and faculty status.

Table 6 Other survey results.

## PREFACE

I would like to acknowledge the following people who have helped to make this paper possible. First is the Rev. James Pakala, whose primary research inspired me to do a similar survey, and who was so encouraging and helpful along the way. Second are the members of ATLA who responded to the survey with such enthusiasm and in such great numbers. Third is my advisor, Dr. Greg Byerly, who willingly agreed to be my advisor, and who offered timely and sound advice.

## INTRODUCTION

The American Theological Library Association is an association of librarians working in theological libraries. Although the predominance of membership consists of institutions and individuals within the United States and Canada, the membership also includes some institutions and individuals located overseas (examples are Belgium, Australia and Taiwan). Its stated purpose is

> to bring its members into close working relations with each other and with the American Association of Theological Schools, to study the distinctive problems of the theological library, and to promote library service and librarianship among the institutions of AATS and theological education in general. The Association shall direct and carry on a program of activities to advance: (a) the standards of library service in the broadest sense, in theological libraries, and (b) the continued professional and scholarly growth of those engaged in work in these libraries. (Kent and Lancour, 1968).

Begun in 1947 with fifty founding members, the membership of ATLA has grown to include 397 individual members, 184 institutional members, thirty-seven student members, seven honorary members, and fifty-six retired members as of June 1992 (taken from the membership lists of Sponberg, 1992). Activities include annual conferences, and the association is responsible through committees for the publications of "Microcard Theological Studies", ATLA Index to Religious Periodical Literature (1947-date), Bibliography of Masters Theses in Religion, and their annual Proceedings and quarterly Newsletter.

The issue of faculty status for theological librarians was first presented in a paper by John D. Batsel in 1972 at the annual meeting of ATLA (Batsel, 1972). This was largely a discussion of the Association of College & Research Libraries

"Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians: Revision" (American Library Association, 1971), which was adopted by the Association of College & Research Libraries in June of 1971. The response of ATLA to Batsel's paper was the creation of an ad hoc ATLA committee to survey the ATLA membership and also non-ATLA members who are working in theological libraries to discover "1) each librarian's present status, 2) his/her view of what a theological librarian's status should become, 3) what the qualifications should be for attaining this status, and 4) whether he/she would like to see ATLA involve itself in this issue." (Griffis, 1973)

In partial response to the need for research, James Pakala conducted a survey in 1978 of all of the institutional members of ATLA. He presented his findings to the Committee on Standards of Accreditation of the American Theological Library Association in 1980. His data confirmed his hypothesis that "head librarians dominate the profession in terms of qualifications for and characteristics of faculty status" (Pakala, 1980). There has been no indication in the literature of any follow-up study.

This, of course, presents the basis of my present interest and study. As a newcomer to the field of librarianship, and being interested in theological librarianship specifically, the current status for the majority of theological librarians working in an academic setting is of personal interest. Do Pakala's findings from 1978 give a fair indication of the present status of theological librarians? Do head librarians still dominate the field in terms of faculty status?

Have theological schools made other concessions to librarians which have mitigated their push for full faculty status? What is the current status of librarians working in theological library settings within the American Theological Library Association? How does their status compare to that of other academic librarians?

For the purposes of this paper, the standards developed and adopted by the Association of College & Research Libraries will be used to define faculty status. Those standards, as revised and approved by the American Library Standards Committee in January 1992, are as follows.

> 1. **Professional responsibilities**. Librarians must be able to exercise independent judgment in the performance of professional duties. While librarians must have considerable latitude in fulfilling their assigned responsibilities, there must also be a regular and rigorous review of their performance. A necessary element of this review must be appraisal be a committee of peers who have access to the evidence pertaining to job performance, service, and scholarship, subject to appropriate institutional policy.
>
> 2. **Library governance**. College and university librarians should adopt an academic form of governance similar in manner and structure to other faculties on the campus.
>
> 3. **College and university governance**. Librarians should be eligible for membership in the faculty senate or equivalent governing body on the same basis as other faculty. They should have the same degree of representation as other academic units on all college or university governing bodies.
>
> 4. **Compensation**. Salaries should be comparable to and within the range of salaries paid to other faculty of equivalent rank. The appointment period for librarians should be the same as it is for equivalent faculty. Salary scales should be adjusted in an equitable manner for any additional periods of appointment. Fringe benefits should be equivalent to those for faculty in general.
>
> 5. **Tenure**. Librarians should be covered by tenure policies equivalent to those of other faculties. During the probationary period, librarians should have annual written contracts or agreements the same as those of other faculty.

6. **Promotion**. Librarians should be promoted in rank on the basis of their academic proficiency and professional effectiveness (job performance, service, and scholarship). A peer review system is the primary basis of judgment in the promotion process for academic librarians. The standards used by the library should be consistent with the campus standards for faculty.

7. **Leaves**. Sabbatical and other research leaves should be available to librarians on the same basis, and with the same requirements as they are available to other faculty.

8. **Research and development funds**. Librarians should have access to funding for research projects and professional development on the same basis as other faculty.

9. **Academic freedom**. Librarians must have the same protection of academic freedom as all other faculty. Censorship of any type is unacceptable whether individual or organizational. All librarians must be free to provide access to information regardless of content. (American Library Association, 1992, pp. 317-318.)

## LITERATURE REVIEW

In view of the limited amount of specific literature on faculty status for theological librarians, the literature review includes, as appropriate, some general studies on the status of librarians in academic library settings.

The most helpful literature in beginning to research this topic has been the preponderance of bibliographies on the subject. The abundance of literature written, as well as the fact that some have taken the time to continue to update existing bibliographies, indicates a continued interest on the part of academic librarians in the topic.

The most recent comprehensive annotated bibliography on this topic is Johnson's (1992). Johnson cites over 300 English-language articles and books published between 1973-1991, with annotations or abstracts which are very helpful in locating literature on a specific sub-topic within the subject. The first extensive annotated bibliography is by Huling (1973). Huling cites 218 English-language titles published between 1878-1973, although the citations are older and the annotations are more brief.

Between these two have come various selective bibliographies, one of the more extensive being Werrell and Sullivan (1985), which lists 121 items published from 1974-1985, and groups the items by year, then alphabetically. A more recent bibliography that is not annotated is Savage (1992), which covers 130 items published between 1953 and 1991. The most recent and also the most selective of those named so far is Krompart (1992). Krompart cites only 79

sources, but does provide annotations, and classifications. These bibliographies provide an excellent introduction to the topic as it has developed from 1878 to 1992.

As my intention is to conduct a survey, this part of the literature review has been limited to earlier surveys. No attempt is made to discuss the pros and cons of faculty status for librarians. Recent reviews of the literature on this topic may be found in DeBoer and Culotta (1987), and Werrell and Sullivan (1987), while some of the older works on the topic are Massman (1972) and "The Three Faces of Eve" (1977).

One of the more recent surveys done to ascertain the extent of faculty status among academic librarians is that conducted by the Academic Status Committee of the Association of College & Research Libraries (Lowry, 1993). This committee took a random sample of all institutions in the United States and surveyed all of the academic members of the Association of Research Libraries. Their overall results were that 67 percent of higher education institutions grant faculty status to librarians. Among the ARL member 46 percent of the responding institutions grant faculty status to librarians. The major problem with these figures is that the committee did not use the standards developed by ACRL to define faculty status. Instead, they allowed the institutions to define faculty status, which may account for the high percentage in the overall results. Although librarians may be considered to be faculty at a specific institution, the survey indicated that only 6 percent of the institutions which responded explicitly

adhere to the ACRL standards to define faculty status.

Another recent survey is that conducted by the Association of Research Libraries Office of Management Studies. This survey was sent to the 107 members of the Association of Research Libraries. The primary question which was asked was "Do librarians at your library have faculty status and are they eligible for tenure?" (Association of Research Libraries, 1992). Of the 87 libraries which responded, 41 percent indicated that they do grant faculty status and tenure, and 59 percent indicated that they do not.

The above survey can be compared to the Lowry survey, as well as to earlier surveys of ARL member institutions. Horn reported that 48 percent of ARL member institutions grant faculty status (Horn, 1984), English reported 46 percent (English, 1982), and Rayman reported 35 percent (Rayman, 1980).

These results can also be compared to an earlier, more explicit survey, which was conducted in 1979 by the Association of Research Libraries Office of Management Studies. In this survey, institutions were given a variety of choices as to what the current status of librarians might be. Of the 91 institutions which responded to this survey, 30 percent indicated that they grant full faculty rank, status and privileges (Association of Research Libraries, 1980). From these studies, it would appear that among Research Libraries members, there is a slight move toward granting faculty status to librarians.

A survey similar to the one conducted by ARL in 1979 was conducted by the Association of College and Research Libraries in 1981, and was sent to non-

ARL libraries. The results of this survey were that of the 126 libraries that responded, 44 percent of the librarians enjoyed full faculty rank, status and privilege. The majority of these were employed in two-year college libraries (23 percent) (American Library Association, 1981).

More recently, Park and Riggs sent a survey to a cross-section of academic libraries, with responses from thirty-five institutions classified as research universities, thirty institutions which grant doctorates, ninety-five comprehensive college and universities, and 144 liberal arts colleges. Of this cross-section, they found that 41 percent grant faculty rank and status to their librarians (Park and Riggs, 1991).

Olevnik's results and open interpretation of faculty status are much closer to the survey results of Lowry. Olevnik surveyed 300 randomly selected college libraries. Of his response from 235 institutions, he found that 73 percent indicated that the librarians had faculty status, as defined by the institution (Olevnik, 1986).

There have also been various regional and state studies conducted on the topic of faculty status for librarians. Davidson, Thorson and Trumpeter conducted a survey of four-year colleges in the Rocky Mountain region. The seven states included in this survey were New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, Idaho, and Montana. Their results indicate that 64 percent of the institutions surveyed granted faculty status to all of their librarians and an additional 24 percent grant faculty status to the director of the library, but not

to all of the librarians (Davidson, Thorson and Trumpeter, 1981).

In 1982 Gray and McReynolds surveyed the directors of 140 academic libraries in the Southeast, which included the states of Louisiana, eastern Texas, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and Florida. Their results indicated that 75 percent of the respondents claimed that they had faculty status, but not all 75 percent adhered to the standards for faculty status developed by ACRL (Gray and McReynolds, 1982).

A similar study conducted by Sharma was sent directly to academic librarians in Alabama, Georgia and Mississippi. Of the respondents, 82 percent indicated that they had faculty status, but again, faculty status was not defined by ACRL standards (Sharma, 1981).

Statewide surveys include those conducted by Pyatt, Williamson and Williamson (1989) in South Carolina, Byerly (1980) in Ohio and Hawkins (1978) in Texas. The definitions of faculty status do not strictly adhere to the ACRL standards for most of these respondents. Pyatt, Williamson and Williamson found that 93 percent of their respondents had faculty status, but only 40 percent had faculty rank and only 83 percent were eligible for tenure (Pyatt, Williamson and Williamson, 1989). Byerly (1980) found that although 57 percent of the library directors worked in institutions which granted faculty status, only a very small percentage of those institutions actually adhere to all of the ACRL standards (2 percent grant an academic year appointment for librarians). Hawkins (1978) had similar results. Although 61 percent of the Texas academic libraries responding

claimed to have faculty status, only 21 percent participate in peer review evaluations, and only 47 percent are eligible for tenure.

Within theological libraries, only one such survey has been conducted, and that was by Pakala in 1978. Pakala found that 33 percent of the head librarians within theological libraries belonging to the ATLA had all the characteristics of faculty status as defined by the ACRL standards. However, only 4 percent of other librarians employed by these libraries shared these characteristics (Pakala, 1980). Concerning qualifications for faculty status, Pakala found that 12 percent of theological librarians had a Doctorate, 36 percent had a Master's Degree in Library Science only, 33 percent had a Master's Degree in Library Science as well as a second subject Master's Degree, 8 percent had a subject Master's Degree only, and 11 percent had no graduate degree.

The surveys on faculty status conducted since 1975 indicate a slight movement toward granting faculty status, or some of the characteristics of faculty status, to academic librarians. Overall, between 41 and 48 percent of ARL member libraries grant faculty status to librarians. The percentages for non-ARL libraries range from 41 to 93 percent, taking into consideration the fact that the ACRL standards are not explicitly used to define faculty status. The only survey conducted in theological libraries found that theological library directors are granted faculty status more often than other theological librarians, but they are far behind other professionals working in the academic library field in their attainment of this status (33 percent).

## RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

Faculty status for academic librarians is still an issue for academic librarians. All of the surveys and studies show that not all academic librarians are given faculty status. Faculty status has been defined by the Association of College and Research Libraries as 1. Professional responsibilities, 2. Library governance, 3. College and university governance, 4. Compensation, 5. Tenure, 6. Promotion, 7. Leaves, 8. Research and development funds, and 9. Academic freedom (American Library Association, 1992, pp. 317-318).

1. Using the ACRL standards of 1992 as a guideline, how many institutions belonging to the American Theological Library Association offer full faculty status to all of their librarians? The American Theological Library Association is an association of librarians working predominantly in academic theological libraries.

2. Is there any difference between the status of head librarians and of other librarians working within the same theological library? Pakala (1980) found that head librarians enjoy faculty status to a much greater extent than other librarians in the theological library setting.

3. What are the qualifications of professional librarians working within a theological setting? Pakala (1980) found that 12 percent of theological librarians had a Doctorate, 36 percent had a Master's Degree in Library Science only, 33 percent had a Master's Degree in Library Science as well as a second subject Master's Degree, 8 percent had a subject Master's Degree only, and 11 percent had no graduate degree.

4. There has been very little in the literature of the American Theological Library Association concerning faculty status for theological librarians in the last thirteen years. Is this still an issue for theological librarians?

5. Does institutional setting of the theological library have a bearing on the granting of faculty status? Some universities offer faculty status to all of their librarians. Private institutions may or may not offer the same status to their librarians.

6. How do theological librarians working within ATLA member institutions compare to other academic librarians in their attainment of faculty status? Granting some variation in the definitions of faculty status, the general surveys indicate that more than half of the academic institutions in the United States offer what they consider to be faculty status to their librarians.

## METHODOLOGY

In order to discover the present status of librarians working in theological library settings, a survey form was mailed to all of the institutional members of the American Theological Library Association which are within an academic setting and within the United States.

Some of the institutional members of ATLA are located outside of the United States, and therefore would not necessarily adhere to the standards for faculty status proposed by the Association of College & Research Libraries. By the same token, this survey would have no meaning for institutional members not located in an academic setting. The total number of institutional members of ATLA in 1992 was 184. Of these, twenty-four are located in Canada and other non-U.S. countries, and ten are located within historical societies, publishing houses, retreat centers and other non-academic settings. The population to which this survey would be meaningful would then be 150. Because this is a very small number, the survey was distributed to the entire population.

The purpose of this survey was to determine how many institutions belonging to the ATLA offer full faculty status to all of their librarians. Full faculty status is defined by ACRL as adherence to nine standards for faculty status (American Library Association, 1992, pp. 317-318). In order to discover this, data was collected on each librarian employed by the member institutions to determine which of the nine standards each librarian is presently entitled to. A survey form was sent to the directors of each of the ATLA member institutions

to fill out for all of the professional librarians working within that institution.

In order to compare the status of theological librarians with that of other academic librarians, a question was included to determine whether or not each institution considers their librarians to have faculty status. Many of the academic surveys did not use the ACRL standards to define faculty status, and the survey by Lowry (1993) found that only 6 percent of all academic institutions explicitly adhere to the ACRL standards, although 67 percent said that they do grant faculty status to their librarians.

Data was collected on the qualifications of professional theological librarians. Pakala (1980) found that 12 percent of theological librarians had a Doctorate, 36 percent had a Master's Degree in Library Science only, 33 percent had a Master's Degree in Library Science as well as a second subject Master's Degree, 8 percent had a subject Master's Degree only, and 11 percent had no graduate degree.

To determine whether or not there is any interest in the topic of faculty status for theological librarians, an open-ended question was included concerning whether or not faculty status is an important issue for theological librarians.

Data was also collected on institutional setting. The data will be used for descriptive purposes only.

This survey form was field tested at a meeting of the Ohio Theological Library Association on May 5, 1993. This association is representative of the larger national body, being composed of librarians working within academic

theological libraries in Ohio. Participants were given the opportunity to comment on the structure of the survey form.

This survey form was then sent to the 150 academic member institutions of the ATLA within the United States. The mailing included a cover letter, the survey form, and a self-addressed, stamped envelope for the survey form to be returned in (See Appendix B). Each envelope was numbered. Once the survey forms were returned, the institution which corresponded to the number on the envelope was crossed off the mailing list to ensure confidentiality of information. The initial mailing yielded a usable response of 70 percent, so no follow-up was deemed necessary.

## DATA ANALYSIS

One hundred and fifty survey forms were sent out on June 1, 1993. By July 15, 1993, 111 survey forms were received back. Of these 111, five were not usable for various reasons (the library was not located within an academic institution being the most common non-usable response). The result was that 106 usable responses were received, yielding a response rate of 70 percent.

Within these 106 institutions, 7 percent offer full faculty status to all of their librarians, as defined by the nine standards of the ACRL. However, when faculty status was defined by the institution, not strictly adhering to the ACRL standards, the result was that 19 percent of these institutions offer faculty status to all of their librarians, 11 percent offer faculty status to some of their librarians, 60 percent offer faculty status only to the head librarian, 6 percent do not grant librarians faculty status, and 4 percent offer an alternative status. Compared to similar surveys which only consider faculty status as defined by the institution, the result is that 90 percent of the institutional ATLA members offer faculty status to at least one of their librarians.

Within these 106 institutions, 14 percent employ one professional only. In 1978, Pakala found that 25 percent of the theological institutions surveyed employed one professional. To compare the status of head librarians with others working in the same institution, a count was made excluding the one-professional libraries. Of the institutions which employ more than one professional librarian, 14 percent offer faculty status to all of their librarians, 13 percent offer faculty

status to some of their librarians, 63 percent offer faculty status only to the head librarian, 7 percent do not offer faculty status to any of their librarians, and 3 percent offer an alternative to faculty status.

In looking at each of the nine standards for faculty status, this survey supports the earlier hypothesis of Pakala that head librarians dominate the field in terms of their attainment of the nine standards. Sixty-one percent of all librarians are engaged in professional responsibilities, while 77 percent of head librarians are engaged in these responsibilities, and 52 percent of other librarians are so engaged. In terms of library governance, 52 percent of all librarians have library governance similar to that of other faculties, while 72 percent of head librarians are engaged in that library governance and only 40 percent of other librarians are so engaged. Forty-four percent of all librarians are eligible for membership in the faculty senate, while 80 percent of head librarians are eligible, and only 23 percent of other librarians are eligible.

Fifty percent of all librarians receive compensation similar to faculty members while 80 percent of head librarians receive this compensation and only 30 percent of other librarians receive similar compensation. Pakala found that in 1978 57 percent of all librarians received compensation similar to faculty, while 81 percent of head librarians received such compensation and 41 percent of other librarians received such compensation. This shows a slight decline in the percentage of theological librarians who receive compensation similar to that of faculty members.

Thirty-one percent of all librarians are eligible for tenure, while 56 percent of the head librarians are eligible, and only 17 percent of other librarians are eligible. Pakala found that in 1978, 38 percent of all librarians were eligible for tenure, while 63 percent of head librarians were eligible and 21 percent of other librarians were eligible. This represents the lowest percentage of the nine standards, and also shows a decline in the percentage of those who have been granted tenure.

In terms of promotion, 34 percent of all librarians have promotion possibilities similar to that of faculty, while 61 percent of head librarians have these possibilities and 19 percent of other librarians have these possibilities. Pakala found that 50 percent of all librarians had promotion possibilities, and 72 percent of head librarians had promotion possibilities while 35 percent of other librarians had such possibilities. This shows a slight decline in the percentage of librarians who have promotion possibilities similar to that of faculty.

Concerning leaves, 35 percent of all librarians have sabbatical and research leaves, while 62 percent of head librarians have such leaves and 20 percent of other librarians have such leaves. Pakala found that 37 percent of all librarians had sabbatical and research leaves while 66 percent of head librarians had such leaves and 17 percent of other librarians had similar leaves. There is a slight decline in the overall percentage and in the percentage of head librarians with sabbatical and research leaves, but a slight increase in the percentage of other librarians who now have sabbatical and research leaves.

Access to research funds was limited to 37 percent of all librarians, while 66 percent of head librarians had such access and 21 percent of other librarians had such access. Pakala found that 31 percent of all librarians had access to research funds, while 52 percent of head librarians had such access and 17 percent of other librarians had such access. This shows an increase in the percentage of librarians who now have access to research funds, although the overall percentage is still very low.

Sixty-three percent of all librarians enjoy academic freedom, while 82 percent of head librarians have this freedom and 52 percent of other librarians have such freedom.

This survey found that 18 percent of all librarians enjoy all nine standards, 34 percent of head librarians enjoy all nine standards and 8 percent of other librarians enjoy all nine standards. Pakala found that 15 percent of all librarians enjoyed all nine standards, while 33 percent of head librarians enjoyed all nine standards and 4 percent of other librarians enjoyed all nine standards. Twenty percent of all librarians have none of the nine standards, while 3 percent of head librarians have none of the nine standards and 29 percent of other librarians have none of the nine standards. Pakala found that 18 percent of all librarians had none of the nine standards, while 1 percent of head librarians had none of the standards and 29 percent of other librarians had none of the standards.

Regarding qualifications, Pakala's hypothesis is again proven to be true, that head librarians dominate the field in terms of qualifications for faculty

status. This survey found that 15 percent of all librarians have a Ph.D. or equivalent, while 29 percent of head librarians have a Ph.D. or equivalent and 7 percent of other librarians have the same qualifications. Pakala found that 12 percent of all librarians had a Ph.D. or equivalent, while 24 percent of head librarians had a Ph.D. or equivalent and 4 percent of other librarians had a Ph.D. or equivalent. This shows a slight increase in the percentage of librarians who have earned Ph.D's or equivalent degrees.

Forty-two percent of all librarians have two Master's degrees, a Master's Degree in Library Science and a second subject Master's. Fifty-two percent of head librarians have these two Master's degrees and 35 percent of other librarians have these two Master's degrees. Pakala found that 33 percent of all librarians had two Master's degrees, while 48 percent of head librarians had two Master's degrees and 26 percent of other librarians had two Master's degrees. This shows a gain in the percentage of librarians with a Master's degree in Library Science as well as a second subject Master's degree.

Thirty-six percent of all librarians have only a Master's Degree in Library Science, while 19 percent of head librarians have only a Master's Degree in Library Science and 45 percent of other librarians have only a Master's Degree in Library Science. Pakala found that 36 percent of all librarians had only a Master's Degree in Library Science, while 21 percent of head librarians had only a Master's Degree in Library Science and 45 percent of other librarians had only a Master's Degree in Library Science. This shows only a slight decrease in the

percentage of head librarians with only a Master's Degree in Library Science.

Five percent of all librarians have a Master's degree other than an MLS only, while 1 percent of head librarians have only a subject Master's degree and 7 percent of other librarians have only a subject Master's degree. Pakala found that 8 percent of all librarians had only a subject Master's degree, while 4 percent of head librarians had only a subject Master's degree and 10 percent of other librarians had only a subject Master's degree. This shows a loss in the percentage of librarians with only a subject Master's degree.

Three percent of all librarians today have no graduate degree while none of the head librarians have no graduate degree and 4 percent of other librarians have no graduate degree. Pakala found that 11 percent of all librarians in 1978 had no graduate degree, while 3 percent of head librarians had no graduate degree and 15 percent of other librarians had no graduate degree. This also shows a loss in the percentage of librarians with no graduate degree.

Concerning other qualifications, 33 percent of all librarians teach courses, while 63 percent of head librarians teach and 17 percent of other librarians teach. Pakala found that 34 percent of all librarians taught courses, while 57 percent of head librarians taught and 19 percent of other librarians taught. This shows a slight loss overall in the percentage of all librarians who teach courses, but a gain in the percentage of head librarians who teach.

Thirty-four percent of all librarians give lectures or present papers, while 55 percent of head librarians give lectures or present papers and 23 percent of

other librarians engage in these activities. Pakala found that 28 percent of all librarians gave lectures or presented papers, while 47 percent of head librarians gave lectures and 15 percent of other librarians gave lectures. This shows a gain in the percentage of librarians who give lectures or present papers.

Fifty-five percent of all librarians serve on professional committees, while 79 percent of head librarians serve on such committees and 42 percent of other librarians serve on such committees. Pakala found that 47 percent of all librarians served on committees, while 67 percent of head librarians served on such committees and 34 percent of other librarians served on such committees. This shows a gain in the percentage of librarians who now serve on professional committees.

Thirty-one percent of all librarians engage in research while 53 percent of head librarians engage in research and 19 percent of other librarians engage in research. Pakala found that 27 percent of all librarians engaged in research, while 40 percent of head librarians engaged in research and 19 percent of other librarians engaged in research. This also shows a gain in the percentage of librarians who are now engaged in research.

Thirty percent of librarians today have published papers, while 53 percent of head librarians have published and 18 percent of other librarians have published. Pakala found that 28 percent of all librarians had published in 1978, while 50 percent of head librarians had published and 14 percent of other librarians had published. This shows a gain in the percentage of librarians who

have published papers.

When asked on the survey form whether or not faculty status is still an issue, 41 percent replied that it is an issue, 49 percent replied that it is not an issue, and 10 percent gave either a mixed response or no response. For those working in institutions which offer faculty status to all of their librarians, 70 percent replied that faculty status is an issue. For those working in institutions where the librarians are not granted faculty status, 83 percent said it was not an issue. For those working in institutions where only the head librarian is granted faculty status, 57 percent said it is not an issue, while 32 percent said that it is.

Institutional setting appears to have some bearing upon faculty status, though the relationship is not a strong one, and was not specifically tested by this survey instrument. There were twenty-one responses from ATLA members located within a college or university setting. Of these twenty-one, 38 percent offer faculty status to all of their librarians, 14 percent offer faculty status to some of their librarians, 29 percent offer faculty status only to the head librarian, 14 percent do not offer faculty status to their librarians, and 5 percent offer an alternative status. There were eighty responses from ATLA members located within independent institutions. Of these eighty, 14 percent offer faculty status to all of their librarians, 11 percent offer faculty status to some of their librarians, 67 percent offer faculty status only to the head librarian, 4 percent offer no faculty status to their librarians and 4 percent offer an alternative status. It appears that a college or university library is more apt to offer faculty status to

all of their librarians than an independent library, but overall, college or university libraries deny a greater percentage of librarians faculty status than do the independent libraries. Independent libraries are more apt to offer faculty status only to the head librarian.

Overall, 90 percent of the institutions surveyed offer some form of faculty status to some or all of their librarians, and 7 percent of the institutions adhere to the ACRL standards for faculty status. This compares favorably with the results found in other surveys. Lowry (1993) found that 67 percent enjoy faculty status, and 6 percent adhere to the ACRL standards. The ARL surveys of 1992, 1984 and 1982 found 41 percent, 48 percent and 46 percent of academic librarians employed by ARL libraries enjoy faculty status. Park and Riggs (1991) found that 41 percent of academic librarians enjoy faculty status, and Olevnik (1986) found that 73 percent enjoy faculty status.

When looking for a reason to explain this high percentage of faculty status, it was pointed out to the researcher that the Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, which is the accrediting body for theological schools, recommends that "The library administrator should ordinarily possess graduate degrees in both library science and theology, and ordinarily be a voting member of the faculty." (The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1992) Perhaps this helps to explain the high percentage of faculty status for head librarians, as well as the low percentage of adherence to the ACRL standards for faculty status, as these standards are not used to define

faculty status.

## SIGNIFICANCE

It would appear from these survey results that academic theological libraries compare favorably with other academic libraries in terms of offering faculty status to at least the head librarian (90 percent as compared to 67 percent for Lowry in 1993 and 73 percent for Olevnik in 1980). However, with only a 7 percent adherence to the nine standards which define faculty status according to ACRL, the definition of "faculty status" differs greatly from one institution to the next.

Of the nine standards, the highest percentage of theological librarians enjoy academic freedom (63 percent), with professional responsibilities being a close second at 61 percent. The lowest percentages of librarians enjoy tenure (31 percent), promotions (34 percent), leaves (35 percent) and access to research and development funds (37 percent) on the same basis as for other faculty. Head librarians enjoy all nine standards to a greater extent than other theological librarians (34 percent compared to 8 percent).

It would also appear that theological librarians have been active in becoming more qualified for faculty status in the last fifteen years. Pakala (1978) found that 11 percent of theological librarians had no graduate degree in 1978, while this survey found that only 3 percent presently have no graduate degree. Pakala also found that 12 percent had a doctorate, while today 15 percent of theological librarians have a doctorate. Theological librarians have also gained in the percentage of librarians with two graduate degrees, a Master's Degree in

Library Science as well as a second subject Master's Degree. Pakala found that in 1978, 33 percent of all librarians had these two degrees, while today 42 percent of all librarians have these two degrees.

However, theological librarians still need to work to improve other qualifications for faculty status, such as engaging in research and publication (31 and 30 percent), teaching classes (33 percent), and presenting papers and lectures (34 percent). Although these qualifications may not be necessary to gain faculty status, they could be used to justify receiving faculty status.

It would appear that faculty status is still an issue for a large number of librarians working in theological libraries. It was surprising to discover that for the majority of those who work in institutions which grant faculty status, it is an issue, while for the majority of those who work in institutions which do not grant faculty status, it is not an issue.

It would be desirable, from these results, to see some recommendations from the American Theological Library Association, as well as from the Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, on adopting the Association of College and Research Libraries' standards for faculty status, as well as recommending that all theological librarians, not just the head librarians, be granted faculty status.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

American Library Association, Association of College and Research Libraries, Committee on Academic Status. Academic Status: Statements and Resources. Chicago: American Library Association, 1988.

American Library Association, Association of College and Research Libraries, Academic Status Committee. "Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians: Revision." College & Research Libraries News, 32 (February 1971): 36-37.

American Library Association, Association of College and Research Libraries, Committee on Academic Status. "Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians." College & Research Libraries News, 53 (May 1992): 317-318.

American Library Association, Association of College and Research Libraries, Committee on Academic Status. Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: A History and Policy Statements. Chicago: American Library Association, 1975.

American Library Association, Association of College and Research Libraries. Academic Status Survey. Chicago: American Library Association, 1981.

Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies, Systems and Procedures Exchange Center. The Status of Librarians: An Overview. (SPEC Kit No. 61). Washington, D. C.: Association of Research Libraries, 1980.

Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada. Procedures, Standards, and Criteria for Membership. Pittsburgh: Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, Bulletin 40, 1992.

Batsel, John D. "Faculty Status of Academic Librarians." In American Theological Library Association: Summary of Proceedings, 26 (1972): 151-156.

Batt, Fred. "Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: Justified or Just a Farce?" In Issues in Academic Librarianship: Views and Case Studies for the 1980s and 1990s, ed. Peter Spyers-Duran and Thomas W. Mann, Jr., 115-128. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1985.

Byerly, Greg. "The Faculty Status of Academic Librarians in Ohio." College & Research Libraries, 41 (September 1980): 422-429.

Davidson, Russ, Connie Capers Thorson, and Margo C. Trumpeter. "Faculty Status for Librarians in the Rocky Mountain Region: A Review and Analysis." College & Research Libraries, 42 (May 1981): 203-213.

DeBoer, Kee and Wendy Culotta. "The Academic Librarian and Faculty Status in the 1980s: A Survey of the Literature." College & Research Libraries, 48 (May 1987): 215-223.

DePew, John N. "The ACRL Standards for Faculty Status: Panacea or Placebo." College & Research Libraries, 44 (November 1983): 407-413.

English, Thomas G. "Librarian Status in the Eighty-Nine U. S. Academic Institutions of the Association of Research Libraries: 1982." College & Research Libraries, 44 (May 1983): 199-211.

Gray, Becky Bolte and Rosalee McReynolds. "A Comparison of Academic Librarians with and without Faculty Status in the Southeast." College & Research Libraries, 44 (July 1983): 283-287.

Griffis, Barbara Marjorie. "A Proposed Role for ATLA: A Study of Faculty Status for Theological Librarians." In American Theological Library Association: Summary of Proceedings, 27 (1973): 84-86.

Hawkins, Jo Anne. The Status of Status: The Status of Librarians in Texas Academic Libraries, 1978. ERIC ED 178 042.

Horn, Judy. "Peer Review for Librarians and Its Application in ARL Libraries." In Academic Libraries: Myths and Realities. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 1984.

Huling, Nancy. "Faculty Status--A Comprehensive Bibliography." College & Research Libraries, 34 (November 1973): 440-462.

Johnson, Karl E. An Annotated Bibliography of Faculty Status in Library and Information Science. University of Illinois, Graduate School of Library and Information Science. Occasional Papers 193. Champaign, IL: Graduate School of Library and Information Science, Publications Office, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1992.

Jones, Arthur E, Jr. "Faculty Status for Librarians." In American Theological Library Association: Summary of Proceedings, 27 (1973): 86-89.

Kent, Allen and Harold Lancour, eds. Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science. New York: Marcel Dekker, 1968. S.v. "American Theological Library Association," by Thomas Edward Camp.

Krompart, Janet. "Researching Faculty Status: A Selective Annotated Bibliography." College & Research Libraries, 53 (September 1992): 439-449.

Krompart, Janet and Clara DiFelice. "A Review of Faculty Status Surveys, 1971-1984." Journal of Academic Librarianship, 13 (March 1987): 14-18.

Lowry, Charles B. "The Status of Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: A Twenty-year Perspective." College & Research Libraries, 54 (March 1993): 168-172.

Massman, Virgil F. Faculty Status for Librarians. Metuchen, N. J.: The Scarecrow Press, 1972.

Miller, William. "Faculty Status in the College Library." In College Librarianship, ed. William Miller and D. Stephen Rockwood, 118-134. Metuchen, N. J.: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1981.

Olevnik, Peter P. A Study of the Organizational Implications of Faculty Status for Librarians in the College Library, 1980. ERIC ED 270 121.

Pakala, James C. Faculty Status and Theological Librarians. Report presented at Drexel University and to the Committee on Standards of Accreditation of the American Theological Library Association, 1980.

Park, Betsy and Robert Riggs. "Status of the Profession: A 1989 National Survey of Tenure and Promotion Policies for Academic Librarians." College & Research Libraries, 52 (May 1991): 275-289.

Payne, Joyce and Janet Wagner. "Librarians, Publication, and Tenure." College & Research Libraries, 45 (March 1984): 133-139.

Pyatt, Sherman E., Josephine B. Williamson, and Edgar Williamson. "Faculty Status in South Carolina." College & Research Libraries News, 50 (November 1989): 927-933.

Rayman, Ronald and Frank Wm. Goudy. "Research and Publication Requirements in University Libraries." College & Research Libraries, 41 (January 1980): 43-48.

Savage, Daniel A. Bibliography on Academic and/or Faculty Status for Librarians, 1992. ERIC ED 344 590.

Sharma, Prabha. "A Survey of Academic Librarians and Their Opinions Related to Nine-Month Contracts and Academic Status Configurations in Alabama, Georgia, and Mississippi." College & Research Libraries, 42 (November 1981): 561-570.

Sponberg, Susan E., ed. Summary of Proceedings Forty-Sixth Annual Conference of the American Theological Library Association, June 17-20, 1992. Evanston, IL.: American Theological Library Association, 1992.

"The Three Faces of Eve: Or, the Identity of Academic Librarianship, a Symposium." Journal of Academic Librarianship, 2 (January 1977): 276-285.

Werrell, Emily and Laura Sullivan. "Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: A Review of the Literature." College & Research Libraries, 48 (March 1987): 95-103.

Werrell, Emily and Laura Sullivan. Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: An Annotated Bibliography, 1985. ERIC ED 274 364.

# APPENDIX A

**TABLE 1**

ATLA INSTITUTIONS AND NINE STANDARDS OF FACULTY STATUS

| | 1993 | | | 1978 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | All | Heads | Others | All | Heads | Others |
| 1. Professional responsibilities. | 61% | 77% | 52% | • | • | • |
| 2. Library governance. | 52% | 72% | 40% | • | • | • |
| 3. College and university governance. | 44% | 80% | 23% | • | • | • |
| 4. Compensation. | 50% | 80% | 30% | 57% | 81% | 41% |
| 5. Tenure. | 31% | 56% | 17% | 38% | 61% | 21% |
| 6. Promotion. | 34% | 61% | 19% | 50% | 71% | 35% |
| 7. Leaves. | 35% | 62% | 20% | 37% | 66% | 17% |
| 8. Research and development funds. | 37% | 66% | 21% | 31% | 52% | 17% |
| 9. Academic freedom. | 63% | 82% | 52% | • | • | • |
| 10. All of the standards. | 8% | 34% | 8% | 15% | 33% | 4% |
| 11. None of the standards. | 20% | 3% | 29% | 18% | 1% | 29% |

| | |
|---|---|
| All librarians have faculty status | 19% |
| Some of the librarians have faculty status | 11% |
| Only the head librarian has faculty status | 60% |
| None of the librarians have faculty status | 6% |
| Other status | 4% |

| | |
|---|---|
| Institutions which adhere to all nine ACRL standards | 7% |
| Head librarians with all nine ACRL standards | 34% |
| Other librarians with all nine ACRL standards | 8% |

**TABLE 2**

COMPARISON OF HEAD LIBRARIANS WITH OTHER LIBRARIANS

| | |
|---|---|
| One professional only in the library | 14% |
| <u>More than one professional in the library</u> | |
| All have faculty status | 14% |
| Some have faculty status | 13% |
| Only the head has faculty status | 63% |
| None have faculty status | 7% |
| Other status | 3% |

**TABLE 3**

FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS

| | 1993 | | | 1978 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | All | Heads | Others | All | Heads | Others |
| 1. Ph.D. or equivalent | 15% | 29% | 7% | 12% | 24% | 4% |
| 2. Enrolled in Ph.D. program | 3% | 4% | 1% | 7% | • | • |
| 3. M.L.S. only | 36% | 19% | 45% | 36% | 21% | 45% |
| 4. Master's other than M.L.S. only | 5% | 1% | 7% | 8% | 4% | 10% |
| 5. M.L.S. and Subject Master's Degree | 42% | 52% | 35% | 33% | 48% | 26% |
| 6. Enrolled in Master's program | 5% | 4% | 5% | • | • | • |
| 7. Teaches courses (credit or non-credit) | 33% | 63% | 17% | 34% | 57% | 19% |
| 8. Gives lectures, presents papers, etc. | 34% | 55% | 23% | 28% | 47% | 15% |
| 9. Serves on professional committees | 55% | 79% | 42% | 47% | 67% | 34% |
| 10. Engages in research | 31% | 53% | 19% | 27% | 40% | 19% |
| 11. Has published | 30% | 53% | 18% | 28% | 50% | 14% |
| 12. Other | 4% | 7% | 1% | • | • | • |
| 13. No graduate degree | 3% | 0% | 4% | 11% | 3% | 15% |
| 14. None of the qualifications | 2% | 0% | 3% | • | • | • |

**TABLE 4**

FACULTY STATUS AND FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS

All librarians have faculty status

| | |
|---|---|
| Ph.D. | 10% |
| MLS + Subject Master's | 40% |
| MLS only | 38% |
| Subject Master's only | 12% |

Some librarians have faculty status

| | |
|---|---|
| Ph.D. | 26% |
| MLS + Subject Master's | 43% |
| MLS only | 28% |
| Subject Master's only | 2% |

Only the head librarian has faculty status

Head Librarian's Qualifications

| | |
|---|---|
| Ph.D. | 32% |
| MLS + Subject Master's | 57% |
| MLS only | 9% |
| Subject Master's only | 0% |
| No graduate degree | 2% |

Other librarians' Qualifications

| | |
|---|---|
| Ph.D. | 4% |
| MLS + Subject Master's | 32% |
| MLS only | 51% |
| Subject Master's only | 7% |
| No graduate degree | 6% |

Other Status

| | |
|---|---|
| Ph.D. | 9% |
| MLS + Subject Master's | 36% |
| MLS only | 45% |
| Subject Master's only | 0% |
| No graduate degree | 9% |

None of the librarians have faculty status

| | |
|---|---|
| Ph.D. | 11% |
| MLS + Subject Master's | 44% |
| MLS only | 39% |
| Subject Master's only | 6% |

TABLE 5

INSTITUTIONAL SETTING AND FACULTY STATUS

College/University Setting

| | |
|---|---|
| All have faculty status | 38% |
| Some have faculty status | 14% |
| Only the head has faculty status | 29% |
| None have faculty status | 14% |
| Other status | 5% |

Independent Institutional Setting

| | |
|---|---|
| All have faculty status | 14% |
| Some have faculty status | 11% |
| Only the head has faculty status | 67% |
| None have faculty status | 4% |
| Other status | 4% |

**TABLE 6**

OTHER SURVEY RESULTS

| Survey | Faculty status |
|---|---|
| Lowry (1993) | 67% |
| ARL (1992) | 41% |
| ARL (1984) | 48% |
| ARL (1982) | 46% |
| ARL (1980) | 35% |
| Park & Riggs (1991) | 41% |
| Olevnik (1986) | 73% |
| Davidson, et al (1981) | 88% |
| Gray, et al (1982) | 75% |
| Sharma (1981) | 82% |
| Pyatt, et al (1989) | 93% |
| Byerly (1980) | 57% |
| Hawkins (1978) | 61% |
| Pakala (1978) | 37% |
| Kemper (1993) | 90% |

# APPENDIX B

Graduate College
(216) 672-2660

Kent STATE UNIVERSITY
Kent Ohio 44242-0001

June 1, 1993

Dear Theological Librarian,

The topic of **faculty status** for academic librarians continues to be debated. Many surveys have been done to determine the faculty status of librarians working in a variety of academic settings. Only one such survey has been done for librarians working in theological libraries. This was done by the Rev. James Pakala in 1978, and he found that overall, the head librarians in theological libraries enjoy faculty status to a much greater extent than do other librarians working in theological libraries.

I am currently working on my Master of Library Science degree from Kent State University. One of the degree requirements is the completion of a research project. I have chosen to do this **survey of theological libraries which are members of the American Theological Library Association** to determine the present extent of faculty status among theological librarians. This will serve to add to the knowledge base for theological librarians, and will help us as a group to compare ourselves to our colleagues working in other academic settings. I hope to disseminate the results of this survey through the ATLA Newsletter.

The Kent State University Institutional Review Board requires **voluntary, informed participation** in any research project, and the **strict confidentiality** of results. You may choose not to participate, or you may withdraw from this study at any time. Enclosed is a stamped, pre-addressed envelope for your convenience in returning the survey. The number on the envelope will indicate which surveys have been returned so that you will not receive any further mailings. Once the number has been recorded, the envelope will be thrown away in order to ensure the confidentiality of results.

I can offer no financial incentives or other rewards to motivate your participation. I would appeal to your professional motivation to further knowledge in the field, and to aid a newcomer to the field. I have kept the survey brief, so that it may only take ten to fifteen minutes of your time. **Thank you so very much for your prompt response!**

Sincerely,

Dr. Greg Byerly, PhD, MLS
Research Advisor

Ann L. Kemper, MDiv, MLS (1993)
Graduate Student

P.S. Please return the completed survey by **June 15, 1993**. Thank you very much.

## FACULTY STATUS OF THEOLOGICAL LIBRARIANS IN THE AMERICAN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

The Association of College & Research Libraries uses the following nine standards to define faculty status (Revised, 1992). (College & Research Libraries News, 53 (5): 317-318)

1. **Professional responsibilities**. Including peer review of job performance, service, and scholarship.
2. **Library governance**. Similar in manner and structure to other faculties on the campus.
3. **College and university governance**. Eligible for membership in the faculty senate, representation on other academic units.
4. **Compensation**. Salaries, appointment period and benefits all comparable to those of faculty.
5. **Tenure**. The same as other faculty.
6. **Promotion**. Based on academic proficiency and professional effectiveness, consistent with faculty standards.
7. **Leaves**. Sabbatical and other research leaves available on the same basis and with the same requirements as other faculty.
8. **Research and development funds**. Access to funding on the same basis as other faculty.
9. **Academic freedom**. The same protection as all other faculty.

1) The 1978 Pakala survey of theological librarians found that on the whole, head librarians enjoy more of the privileges of faculty status than do other librarians. Please indicate below the **job title** of each professional librarian, and **circle the number which corresponds to each of the nine standards above** to which each librarian is entitled. (Use the back of this sheet for additional professionals.)

#1 Librarian (Head)_____ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

#2 Librarian _____ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

#3 Librarian _____ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

#4 Librarian _____ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

#5 Librarian _____ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

2) Which of the following best describes the **status of librarians** at your institution?

____ All librarians have faculty status

____ Some of the librarians have faculty status

____ Only the head librarian has faculty status

____ None of the librarians have faculty status

____ Other (please explain)

3) What are the **qualifications** of each professional librarian at your institution? Please circle the number of **all** which apply for each librarian.

1. Ph.D or equivalent
2. Enrolled in Ph.D. program
3. M.L.S.
4. Master's degree other than M.L.S.
5. Enrolled in Master's program
6. Teaches courses (credit or non-credit)
7. Gives lectures, presents papers, etc.
8. Serves on professional committees, organizes workshops, etc.
9. Engages in research
10. Has published
11. Other (please specify)

#1 Librarian (Head/Director)_____ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

#2 Librarian _____ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

#3 Librarian _____ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

#4 Librarian _____ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

#5 Librarian _____ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

4) **Is faculty status an important issue** for librarians working in your institution?

5) Is your institution

_____ attached to a university

_____ independent

_____ other (please explain)

COMMENTS

**THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PROMPT RESPONSE!**

Please return this survey by **June 15, 1993** to:
Ann L. Kemper, 1759 Willoway Circle North, Columbus, Ohio 43220.